Message

From: Detlef Knappe [knappe@ncsu.edu]
Sent: 2/24/2016 7:46:47 PM
To: Strynar, Mark [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=5a9910d5b38e471497bd875fd329a20a-Strynar, Mark]; Hillary Stoll [hjstoll@ncsu.edu]
CC: Lindstrom, Andrew [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=04bf7cf26aa44ce29763fbc1c1b2338e-Lindstrom, Andrew]
Subject: Re: WAX versus HLB

Thank you for the update, Mark. This sounds promising!
Hillary, can you take a look at response factors for these results?
Thank you,
Detlef

On 2/24/16 2:20 PM, Strynar, Mark wrote:

> FYI,
>
> I looked at the work we did yesterday. The WAX worked very well for all, and the HLB did poorly for m/z 229 and 279 which are PFECA F and A respectively. HLB worked similarly for all others compared to the WAX. As expected the HLB does poorly for the low molecular weight PFCAs and the PFECAs. The A and F PFECA are the two smallest. I propose using WAX capture of the compounds in 500 mL of water and a UPLC MS/MS analysis on the Acquity system.
>
> There was some contamination of the PFECA G compound in the MB but not other compounds. I think we can work with this small amount as it was lower than the lowest curve point (10 ng/L).
>
> We will now need to do more like 6-7 point cal curves and try to add some ISs we have (PFBA, PFHxA and PFOA) to serve as IS in the absence of matched IS compounds.
>
> Mark

--
Detlef Knappe
Professor
319-E Mann Hall
Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering
North Carolina State University
Campus Box 7908
Raleigh, NC 27695-7908

Phone: 919-515-8791
Fax: 919-515-7908
E-mail: knappe@ncsu.edu
Web page: http://knappelab.wordpress.ncsu.edu/